

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **18 April 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-28. Examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Pleso (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,480, hereinafter “Pleso”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, Examiner avers that the specification is silent regarding the limitation “avoiding the need of downloading and installing the universal contextual interface onto the second device”

Accordingly, Applicant has removed the instances of the referred limitation from the independent claims 1, 11, and 20. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1-28 as in condition to overcome the 112 rejection. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 20 were rejected as being anticipated by Pleso. Applicant respectfully points out that Pleso fails to teach that a requesting device **registers as a listener** with a source device **through a notification interface** of the source device **to receive event notifications** with respect to changes in the contextual data associated with the source device.

Applicant respectfully points out that in the instant application, the contextual-data-requesting device is configured to determine if the source device is associated with a notification interface. If so, the requesting device can register itself as a listener with the source device through the notification interface to receive event notifications with respect to changes in the contextual data associated with the source device. More specifically, the requesting device can

invoke a *register()* operation associated with the notification interface to register itself and the source device can decide if the requesting device is allowed to register as a listener to receive the event notification. If so, the requesting device is allowed to receive and view the updates associated with the contextual-data of the source device (see paragraph [0041] of the instant application).

Applicant respectfully points out that Pleso is different from the instant application. Specifically, Pleso describes a communication technique for **downloading a device driver for a peripheral device directly from the peripheral device to a computer system, and installing the device driver on the computer system** (see Pleso, col. 2, lines 39-65, and col. 8, lines 30-65). The technique of Pleso is different from the teaching of the present invention at least because Pleso does not provide a registration mechanism (such as a notification interface) for the computer system to register with one or more of the peripheral devices so that the computer system can receive and view regularly event updates associated with the device driver for the peripheral device.

There is nothing within Pleso, either explicit or implicit, which suggests that **the second device (i.e., the requesting device) registers as a listener with the first device (i.e., the source device) through a notification interface of the first device to receive event notifications with respect to changes in the contextual data associated with the first device.**

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 20 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention provide a notification interface associated with the first device so that the second device can register as a listener with the first device to receive event notifications with respect to changes in the contextual data associated with the first device. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0041] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 20 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-19, which

depend upon claim 11, and claims 21-28, which depend upon claim 20, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 19 June 2008

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com